

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 17 were pending in the application at the time of examination. Claims 1 to 17 stand rejected as anticipated.

Prior to consideration of the pending action, Applicants note that on July 24, 2003, a "Request to Amend Typographical Error in Priority Claim," was filed by first class mail in the U.S.P.T.O. A return receipt postcard was received date stamped July 28, 2003 by the U.S.P.T.O. indicating that the paper was received. As of this date, a response to this paper has not been received and the pending action fails to mention the paper. The Examiner is respectfully requested to inform Applicants of the status of the paper and whether it has been entered in the file and the typographical error in the priority date fixed.

Applicants have amended the description to correct a grammatical error to properly reflect the status of the U.S. Patent Application cited therein.

In the rejection, the Examiner appears to be interpreting "directly-assigned attributes" differently than the phrase is defined in the specification. To avoid a discussion on the interpretation of "directly-assigned attributes," Applicant has amended Claims 1, 7, 8, 14 to include a description of directly-assigned attributes to make clear that it not a selection of a style but rather an object by object assignment by a user. In addition, these claims were amended to clarify that the creating operation is performed automatically without user input.

Claims 1 to 17 stand rejected as being anticipated by Turbo C++ Version 4.5, Borland International, 1995 hereinafter referred to as Borland.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection fails to consider "directly-assigned attributes" in view of the specification. The rejection apparently considers "default

settings of the Borland editor" as directly-assigned attributes. For example,

"The Color SpeedSettings allow you to use preset syntax highlighting color schemes." (Borland, Page 3).

Activating this feature is not creating "directly-assigned attributes," but rather is equivalent to the prior art "style" where predefined formatting is applied to a document. In this case, "preset highlighting color schemes" are applied to syntax in the document. In contrast, Claim 1 recites "attributes in said directly-assigned attributes were assigned to each object individually by a user."

The customization of the "preset highlighting color schemes" using the "Element list box" of Borland is based upon a user manually selecting a syntax element, i.e., "Whitespace, Comment, Reserved Word, Identifier, Symbol, String, Integer, Float," as illustrated on page 14 of Borland, and then the user manually selecting a format attribute for that syntax element.

Selecting a syntax element by a user and then choosing a particular formatting for that element, one of the attributes shown on page 14, teaches away from Applicants' invention as recited in Claim 1, because it is not "detecting objects . . . having directly assigned attributes."

If the Examiner considers use of the "Element list box" conversion, the conversion is not based on directly-assigned attributes but rather syntax. Moreover, the conversion is done manually. Borland is directed at making computer code more readable by identifying particular syntax throughout the code, and is unrelated to facilitating making changes to user assigned attributes that were assigned to objects on an object by object basis.

Moreover, Applicants point out that the user apparently is directly assigning attributes on page 14 of Borland to a group of objects, e.g., all integer syntax in the document, but the

Examiner has cited no teaching, in Borland, of further processing of such directly assigned group attributes. In particular, the Examiner has cited no teaching of

replacing directly-assigned attributes of each detected object by a reference to one conversion style element

To anticipate this, Borland must teach not only "one conversion style element," but also "a reference to one conversion style element."

Only one of the above distinctions is required to overcome the anticipation rejection. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 1. If the Examiner continues the rejection, the Examiner is respectfully requested to point out with more specificity what the Examiner considers to be a "directly assigned attribute," "a conversion style element," and "a reference to a conversion style element," as used and recited in Claim 1 since none of these phrases appear in Borland.

Claim 2 to 6 depend from Claim 1 and so distinguish over Borland for at least the same reasons as Claim 1. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 2 to 6.

With respect to the anticipation rejection of Claim 7, the above comments with respect to Claim 1 are incorporated herein by reference. Moreover, changing a file extension so that the Editor does not recognize the file or conversely affects only the initial display of the file by the Editor. It has nothing to do with whether subsequent operations are performed or not performed. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 7.

Claim 8 stands rejected on the same basis as Claim 1. The above concerning Claim 1 and Borland are applicable to Claim 8 and are incorporated herein by reference. Applicants request

reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 8.

Claim 9 to 13 depend from Claim 8 and so distinguish over Borland for at least the same reasons as Claim 8. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 9 to 13.

Claim 14 stands rejected on the same basis as Claim 1. The above concerning Claim 1 and Borland are applicable to Claim 14 and are incorporated herein by reference. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 14.

Claim 15 to 17 depend from Claim 14 and so distinguish over Borland for at least the same reasons as Claim 14. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 15 to 17.

Claims 1 to 17 remain in the application. Claims 1, 7, 8 and 14 have been amended. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant(s) respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on August 18, 2004.



Attorney for Applicant(s)

August 18, 2004  
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Forrest Gunnison  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Reg. No. 32,899  
Tel.: (831) 655-0880